1	WILLIAM L. ANTHONY, JR. (State Bar No. 106908) ERIC L. WESENBERG (State Bar No. 139696)		
2	HEIDI L. KEEFE (State Bar No. 178960) ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP		
3	1000 Marsh Road	-	
4	Menlo Park, CA 94025 Telephone: (650) 614-7400		
·	Facsimile: (650) 614-7401		
5	JOHN D. VANDENBERG		
6	KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP One World Trade Center, Suite 1600		
7	121 S.W. Salmon Street		
8	Portland, OR 97204 Telephone: (503) 226-7391		
	Facsimile: (503) 228-9446		
9	Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant, MICROSOFT CORPORATION		
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
12			
13		D DIVISION	
14	OAKLAIV		
15	INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,	CASE NO: C 02 0647 SBA	
16	Plaintiff,	MICROSOFT CORPORATION'S ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIMS	
17			
	v.	(HURY TRIAL DEMANDED)	
18	MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington Corporation,	(JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)	
18 19	MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a	(JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)	
	MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington Corporation,  Defendant.	(JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)	
19	MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington Corporation,	(JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)	
19 20	MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington Corporation,  Defendant.  MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a	(JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)	
19 20 21	MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington Corporation,  Defendant.  MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington corporation,	(JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)	
19 20 21 22	MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington Corporation,  Defendant.  MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington corporation,  Counterclaimant,  v.  INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES	(JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)	
19 20 21 22 23	MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington Corporation,  Defendant.  MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington corporation,  Counterclaimant,  v.	(JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)	
19 20 21 22 23 24	MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington Corporation,  Defendant.  MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington corporation,  Counterclaimant,  v.  INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,	(JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)	

DOCSSV1:187692.1

MICROSOFT CORPORATION'S ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIMS - CASE NO. C 02-0647 SBA

Defendant Microsoft Corporation ("Microsoft") answers the Complaint of InterTrust Technologies Corporation ("InterTrust") as follows:

Microsoft admits that the Complaint purports to state a cause of action under the patent laws of the United States, 35 United States Code, §§ 271 and 281. Microsoft denies that it has infringed or now infringes the patent asserted against Microsoft in the Complaint. Microsoft denies any and all remaining allegations of paragraph 1 of the Complaint.

- 1. Microsoft admits that the Complaint purports to state a cause of action over which this Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).
- 2. Microsoft admits, for purposes of this action only, that venue is proper in this judicial district. Microsoft denies any and all remaining allegations of paragraph 3 of the Complaint.
- 3. Upon information and belief, Microsoft admits the allegations of paragraph 4 of the Complaint.
  - 4. Microsoft admits the allegations of paragraph 5 of the Complaint.
- 5. Microsoft admits, for purposes of this action only, that it transacts business in this judicial district. Microsoft denies any and all remaining allegations of paragraph 6 of the Complaint.
- 6. Microsoft admits that on its face the title page of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,721 ("the '721 Patent") states that it was issued December 5, 2000, is entitled "Systems and methods using cryptography to protect secure computing environments," and lists "InterTrust Technologies Corp." as the assignee. Microsoft denies that the '721 Patent was duly and lawfully issued. Microsoft further denies, or lacks information or belief sufficient to admit or deny any and all remaining allegations of paragraph 7 of the Complaint.
- 7. Microsoft repeats and reasserts its responses to paragraphs 1-7 of the Complaint, as if fully restated herein.
- 8. Microsoft admits that the Complaint purports to state a cause of action under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 281. Microsoft denies that it has infringed or now infringes the patent

1	asserted against Microsoft in the Complaint. Microsoft denies any and all remaining allegations
2	of paragraph 9 of the Complaint.
3	9. Microsoft denies, or lacks information and belief sufficient to admit or deny as to
4	InterTrust's claim as to any and all allegations of paragraph 10 of the Complaint.
5	10. Microsoft denies any and all allegations of paragraph 11 of the Complaint.
6	11. Microsoft denies any and all allegations of paragraph 12 of the Complaint.
7	12. Microsoft denies any and all allegations of paragraph 13 of the Complaint.
8	13. Microsoft denies any and all allegations of paragraph 14 of the Complaint.
9	AFFIRMATIVE AND OTHER DEFENSES
10	Further answering the Complaint, Microsoft asserts the following defenses. Microsoft
11	reserves the right to amend its answer with additional defenses as further information is obtained.
12	First Defense: Noninfringement of the Asserted Patent
13	Microsoft has not infringed, contributed to the infringement of, or induced the
14	infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,721 ("the '721 Patent"), and is not liable for infringement
15	thereof.
16	Any and all Microsoft products or actions that are accused of infringement have
17	substantial uses that do not infringe and therefore cannot induce or contribute to the infringement
18	of the '721 Patent.
19	Second Defense: Invalidity of the Asserted Patent
20	On information and belief, the '721 Patent is invalid for failing to comply with the
21	provisions of the Patent Laws, Title 35 U.S.C., including without limitation one or more of
22	35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112.
23	Third Defense: Unavailability of Relief
24	On information and belief, Plaintiff has failed to plead and meet the requirements of 35
25	U.S.C. § 271(b) and is not entitled to any alleged damages prior to providing any actual notice to

DOCSSV1:187692.1

26

27

28

Microsoft of the '721 Patent.

1	
2	
3	U
4	ac
5	
6	
7	U
8	
9	
10	pı
11	OI
12	
13	
14	67
15	รเ
16	
17	
18	S
1,9	
20	
21	sa
22	p
23	li
24	
25	

## Fourth Defense: Unavailability of Relief

On information and belief, Plaintiff has failed to plead and meet the requirements of 35 J.S.C. § 284 for enhanced damages and is not entitled to any damages prior to providing any actual notice to Microsoft of the '721 Patent, and any alleged infringement thereof.

## Fifth Defense: Unavailability of Relief

On information and belief, Plaintiff has failed to plead and meet the requirements of 35 J.S.C. § 287, and has otherwise failed to show that it is entitled to any damages.

## Sixth Defense: Prosecution History Estoppel

Plaintiff's alleged cause of action for patent infringement is barred under the doctrine of prosecution history estoppel, and Plaintiff is estopped from claiming that the '721 Patent covers or includes any accused Microsoft product or method.

### Seventh Defense: Dedication to the Public

Plaintiff has dedicated to the public all methods, apparatus, and products disclosed in the 721 Patent, but not literally claimed therein, and is estopped from claiming infringement by any such public domain methods, apparatus, and products.

# Eighth Defense: Use/Manufacture By/For United States Government

To the extent that any accused product has been used or manufactured by or for the United States, Plaintiff's claims and demands for relief are barred by 28 U.S.C. § 1498.

#### Ninth Defense: License

To the extent that Plaintiff's allegation of infringement is premised on the alleged use, sale, or offer for sale of a product that was manufactured by or for a licensee of InterTrust and/or provided by or to Microsoft to or by a licensee of InterTrust, such allegation is barred pursuant to license.

## Tenth Defense: Acquiescence

Plaintiff has acquiesced in at least those acts of Microsoft that are alleged to infringe the 721 Patent.

26

27

#### Eleventh Defense: Laches

Plaintiff's claims for relief are barred, in whole or in part, by the equitable doctrine of laches.

#### Twelfth Defense: Inequitable Conduct

The '721 Patent claims are unenforceable due to inequitable conduct, including those acts and failures to act set forth in Count III of Microsoft's Counterclaims, set forth below.

#### Thirteenth Defense: Unenforceability

The claims of the '721 Patent are unenforceable due to unclean hands, inequitable conduct and misuse and illegal extension of the patent right, including those acts and failures to act set forth in Count IV of Microsoft's Counterclaims, set forth below.

# COUNTERCLAIMS COUNT I – DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NONINFRINGEMENT

- 1. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 U.S.C. §§ 1, et seq. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this counterclaim under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1338, 2201, and 2202.
- 2. Microsoft Corporation ("Microsoft") is a Washington corporation with its principal place of business in Redmond, Washington.
- 3. On information and belief, Plaintiff/Counterclaim Defendant InterTrust

  Technologies Corporation ("InterTrust") is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Santa Clara, California.
- 4. InterTrust purports to be the owner of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,721 ("the '721 Patent").
  - 5. InterTrust alleges that Microsoft has infringed the '721 Patent.
- 6. InterTrust issued a press release on February 7, 2002. The press release stated that InterTrust had filed a law suit against Microsoft for patent infringement. The press release specificed that InterTrust "alleges infringement by Microsoft's 'Plug and Play' Driver Certification Program."

- 7. Microsoft's certification of hardware drivers has not infringed, either directly or indirectly, any claim of the '721 Patent, and Microsoft is not liable for infringement thereof.
- 8. An actual controversy, within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, exists between Microsoft, on the one hand, and InterTrust, on the other hand, with respect to the infringement or noninfringement of the '721 Patent.

# COUNT II – DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY OF THE '721 PATENT

- 9. Microsoft repeats and realleges paragraphs 1-5 of its Counterclaims, as if fully restated herein.
- 10. The '721 Patent, and each claim thereof, is invalid for failing to comply with the provisions of the Patent Laws, including one or more of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112.
- 11. An actual controversy, within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, exists between Microsoft, on the one hand, and InterTrust, on the other hand, with respect to whether the claims of the '721 Patent are valid or invalid.

#### COUNT III – DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF UNENFORDEABILITY OF THE '721 PATENT

- 12. Microsoft repeats and realleges paragraphs 1-5 of its Counterclaims, as if fully restated herein.
- 13. Claims 1-43 of the '721 Patent application (SN 08/689,754), and claims 1-41 of the '721 Patent, were not and are not entitled to the benefit of any application filing date prior to August 12, 1996, under 35 U.S.C. § 120 or otherwise.
- 14. United States Patent No. 5,910,987 ("the '987 Patent") issued on June 8, 1999, from a continuation of an application filed on February 13, 1995.
- 15. The '987 Patent is prior art to claims 1-8, 10-29, and 31-43 of the '721 Patent application (SN 08/689,754).
- 16. The '987 Patent is prior art to claims 1-41 of the '721 Patent under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

- 17. The '987 Patent was material to the patentability of claims 1-8, 10-29, and 31-43 of the '721 Patent application (SN 08/689,754).
- 18. One or more of the '721 Patent applicants knew, while the '721 Patent application (SN 08/689,754) was pending, of the '987 Patent.
- 19. On information and belief, one or more of the attorneys who prosecuted or assisted in prosecuting the '721 Patent application (SN 08/689,754) knew, while that application was pending, of the '987 Patent.
- 20. The applicants for the '721 Patent did not cite the '987 Patent to the Patent Office as prior art to any of claims 1-43 of the '721 Patent application (SN 08/689,754).
- 21. The applicants for the '721 Patent did not cite to the Patent Office as prior art to any of claims 1-43 of the '721 Patent application (SN 08/689,754) any reference having the same or substantially the same disclosure as the '987 Patent.
- 22. The '987 Patent is not merely cumulative over any reference cited as prior art during the prosecution of the '721 Patent application (SN 08/689,754).
- On information and belief, one or more of the '721 Patent applicants believed, while the '721 Patent application (SN 08/689,754) was pending, that the '987 Patent was material to the patentability of one or more of claims 1-8, 10-29, and 31-43 of the '721 Patent application (SN 08/689,754), but, with deceptive intent, failed to disclose that reference as prior art to the Patent Office.
- 24. The '721 Patent is unenforceable due to the inequitable conduct of the '721 Patent applicants and/or agents before the Patent and Trademark Office in connection with the '721 Patent application (SN 08/689,754).
- 25. An actual controversy, within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, exists between Microsoft, on the one hand, and InterTrust, on the other hand, with respect to whether the claims of the '721 Patent are enforceable.

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

# 

## 

# 

# 

# 

# 

#### 

## 

#### 

#### 

# 

## 

## 

# 

## 

## 

#### 

# COUNT IV – DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF UNENFORCEABILITY

- 26. Microsoft repeats and realleges paragraphs 1-5 and 12-24 of its Counterclaims, as if fully restated herein.
- 27. In prosecuting, marketing, and enforcing various related patents, including the '721 Patent, InterTrust has engaged in a pattern of obfuscation as to the scope of the patents, the prior art to the patents, and the alleged "inventions" of the patents. For example, InterTrust has accused non-infringing products of infringement, has buried Patent Office Examiners with a collection of more than 400 references, many of which were not related to the particular claims in issue, and has buried the Examiners with hundreds or thousands of pages of redundant, verbose, unclear text, effectively prohibiting a real comparison of the alleged "invention" versus the prior art. This pattern of intentional conduct constitutes an abuse of the patent system, unclean hands, misuse and illegal extension of the patent right, rendering the '721 Patent unenforceable, as well as invalid under Section 112.
- 28. An actual controversy, within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, exists between Microsoft, on the one hand, and InterTrust, on the other hand, with respect to whether the claims of the '721 Patent are enforceable.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

## WHEREFORE, Microsoft prays for the following relief:

- A. The Court enter judgment against InterTrust, and dismiss with prejudice, any and all claims of the Complaint;
- B. The Court enter judgment declaring that Microsoft has not infringed, contributed to infringement of, or induced infringement of the '721 Patent;
  - C. The Court enter judgment declaring that the '721 Patent is invalid;
- D. The Court enter judgment declaring that the '721 Patent is unenforceable due to inequitable conduct;
- E. The Court enter judgment declaring that the '721 Patent is unenforceable due to abuse of the patent system, unclean hands, and misuse and illegal extension of the patent right;

1	F.	The Court award attorney fees against InterTrust pursuant to the provisions of 35
2	U.S.C § 285;	
3	G.	The Court award to Microsoft pre-judgment interest and the costs of this actions;
4	H.	The Court award to Microsoft its reasonable costs and attorneys' fees; and
5	I.	The Court grant to Microsoft such other and further relief as may be deemed just
6	and appropria	te
7		JURY DEMAND
8.	Pursua	ant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 38(b), Defendant Microsoft Corporation demands a trial by
9	jury.	
10		
11	Dated: March	125, 2002
12	·	By: Judi Buff
13	,	WILLIAM L. ANTHONY ERIC L. WESENBERG
14		HEIDI L. KEEFE ORRICK HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP
15		1000 Marsh Road Menlo Park, CA 94025
16		Telephone: (650) 614-7400
17		JOHN D. VANDENBERG KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP
18		One World Trade Center, Suite 1600 121 S.W. Salmon Street
19		Portland, OR 97204 Telephone: (503) 226-7391
20		Attorneys for Defendant/Counterclaimant
21		MICROSOFT CORPORATION
22	Of Counsel:	
23	T. Andrew Cu	lbert, Esq.
24	One Microsoft Building 8	t Way
25		A 98052-6399 25) 936-6921
26		
27		
20	1	

1	WILLIAM L. ANTHONY, JR. (State Bar No. 106908) ERIC L. WESENBERG (State Bar No. 139696)		
2	HEIDI L. KEEFE (State Bar No. 178960) ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP		
3	1000 Marsh Road Menlo Park, CA 94025		
4	Telephone: (650) 614-7400 Facsimile: (650) 614-7401		
5		•	
6	STEVEN R. ALEXANDER (admitted <i>Pro Hac</i> KRISTIN L. CLEVELAND (admitted <i>Pro Hac</i>	Vice)	
7.	JAMES E. GERINGER (admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> JOHN D. VANDENBERG	e)	
8	KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP One World Trade Center, Suite 1600		
9	121 S.W. Salmon Street Portland, OR 97204		
10	Telephone: (503) 226-7391 Facsimile: (503) 228-9446		
11	Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant,		
12	MICRÓSOFT CORPORATION		
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
14	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
15	OAKLAND DIVISION		
16 17	INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,	CASE NO: C 02 0647 SBA	
18	Plaintiff,	MICROSOFT CORPORATION'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER AND	
19	v.	COUNTERCLAIMS	
20	MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington Corporation,		
21	Defendant.	-	
22	MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a		
23	Washington corporation,		
24	Counterclaimant,		
25	v.		
26	INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,		
27	Counter-Defendant.		
28		MICROSOFT CORPORATION'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIMS CASE NO. C 02-0647 SBA	
		•	

Defendant Microsoft Corporation ("Microsoft") answers the Complaint of InterTrust Technologies Corporation ("InterTrust") as follows:

- 1. Microsoft admits that the Complaint purports to state a cause of action under the patent laws of the United States, 35 United States Code, §§ 271 and 281. Microsoft denies that it has infringed or now infringes the patent asserted against Microsoft in the Complaint. Microsoft denies any and all remaining allegations of paragraph 1 of the Complaint.
- 2. Microsoft admits that the Complaint purports to state a cause of action over which this Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).
- 3. Microsoft admits, for purposes of this action only, that venue is proper in this judicial district. Microsoft denies any and all remaining allegations of paragraph 3 of the Complaint.
- 4. Upon information and belief, Microsoft admits the allegations of paragraph 4 of the Complaint.
  - 5. Microsoft admits the allegations of paragraph 5 of the Complaint.
- 6. Microsoft admits, for purposes of this action only, that it transacts business in this judicial district. Microsoft denies any and all remaining allegations of paragraph 6 of the Complaint.
- 7. Microsoft admits that on its face the title page of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,721 ("the '721 Patent") states that it was issued December 5, 2000, is entitled "Systems and methods using cryptography to protect secure computing environments," and lists "InterTrust Technologies Corp." as the assignee. Microsoft denies that the '721 Patent was duly and lawfully issued. Microsoft further denies, or lacks information or belief sufficient to admit or deny any and all remaining allegations of paragraph 7 of the Complaint.
- 8. Microsoft repeats and reasserts its responses to paragraphs 1-7 of the Complaint, as if fully restated herein.
- 9. Microsoft admits that the Complaint purports to state a cause of action under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271 and 281. Microsoft denies that it has infringed or now infringes the patent

1	asserted against Microsoft in the Complaint. Microsoft denies any and all remaining allegations	
2	of paragraph 9 of the Complaint.	
3	10. Microsoft denies, or lacks information and belief sufficient to admit or deny as to	
4	InterTrust's claim as to any and all allegations of paragraph 10 of the Complaint.	
5	11. Microsoft denies any and all allegations of paragraph 11 of the Complaint.	
6	12. Microsoft denies any and all allegations of paragraph 12 of the Complaint.	
-7	13. Microsoft denies any and all allegations of paragraph 13 of the Complaint.	
8	14. Microsoft denies any and all allegations of paragraph 14 of the Complaint.	
9	AFFIRMATIVE AND OTHER DEFENSES	
10	Further answering the Complaint, Microsoft asserts the following defenses. Microsoft	
11	reserves the right to amend its answer with additional defenses as further information is obtained.	
12	First Defense: Noninfringement of the Asserted Patent	
13	15. Microsoft has not infringed, contributed to the infringement of, or induced the	
14	infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,721 ("the '721 Patent"), and is not liable for infringement	
15	thereof.	
16	16. Any and all Microsoft products or actions that are accused of infringement have	
17	substantial uses that do not infringe and therefore cannot induce or contribute to the infringemen	
18	of the '721 Patent.	
19	Second Defense: Invalidity of the Asserted Patent	
20	17. On information and belief, the '721 Patent is invalid for failing to comply with the	
21	provisions of the Patent Laws, Title 35 U.S.C., including without limitation one or more of	
22	35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112.	
23	Third Defense: Unavailability of Relief	
24	18. On information and belief, Plaintiff has failed to plead and meet the requirements	
25	of 35 U.S.C. § 271(b) and is not entitled to any alleged damages prior to providing any actual	
26	notice to Microsoft of the '721 Patent.	
27	·	

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	Ì
9	
10	
11	-
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	-
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
23	
26	

#### Fourth Defense: Unavailability of Relief

19. On information and belief, Plaintiff has failed to plead and meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 284 for enhanced damages and is not entitled to any damages prior to providing any actual notice to Microsoft of the '721 Patent, and any alleged infringement thereof.

#### Fifth Defense: Unavailability of Relief

20. On information and belief, Plaintiff has failed to plead and meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 287, and has otherwise failed to show that it is entitled to any damages.

#### Sixth Defense: Prosecution History Estoppel

21. Plaintiff's alleged cause of action for patent infringement is barred under the doctrine of prosecution history estoppel, and Plaintiff is estopped from claiming that the '721 Patent covers or includes any accused Microsoft product or method.

#### Seventh Defense: Dedication to the Public

22. Plaintiff (and its predecessors in interest) has dedicated to the public, and abandoned, all methods, apparatus, and products (a) disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 5,940,504 and not literally claimed therein, (b) disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 5,892,900 and not literally claimed therein, (c) disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 5,917,912 and not literally claimed therein, (d) disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 5,920,861 and not literally claimed therein, (e) disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 5,982,891 and not literally claimed therein, (f) disclosed in the '721 Patent and not literally claimed therein, (g) disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 6,185,683 B1 and not literally claimed therein, and/or (h) disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 6,253,193 B1 and not literally claimed therein, and is estopped from claiming infringement by any such public domain methods, apparatus, and products.

#### Eighth Defense: Use/Manufacture Bv/For United States Government

23. To the extent that any accused product has been used or manufactured by or for the United States, Plaintiff's claims and demands for relief are barred by 28 U.S.C. § 1498.

#### Ninth Defense: License

24. To the extent that Plaintiff's allegation of infringement is premised on the alleged

1	use, sale, or offer for sale of a product that was manufactured by or for a licensee of InterTrust	
2	and/or provided by or to Microsoft to or by a licensee of InterTrust, such allegation is barred	
3	pursuant to license.	
4	Tenth Defense: Acquiescence	
5	25. Plaintiff has acquiesced in at least those acts of Microsoft that are alleged to	
6	infringe the '721 Patent.	
7	Eleventh Defense: Laches	
8	26. Plaintiff's claims for relief are barred, in whole or in part, by the equitable doctrine	
9	of laches.	
10	Twelfth Defense: Inequitable Conduct	
11	27. The '721 Patent claims are unenforceable due to inequitable conduct, including	
12	those acts and failures to act set forth in Count III of Microsoft's Counterclaims, set forth below.	
13	Thirteenth Defense: Unenforceability	
14	28. The claims of the '721 Patent are unenforceable due to unclean hands, inequitable	
15	conduct and misuse and illegal extension of the patent right, including those acts and failures to	
16	act set forth in Count IV of Microsoft's Counterclaims, set forth below.	
17	COUNTERCLAIMS COUNT I – DECLARATORY	
18	JUDGMENT OF NONINFRINGEMENT	
19	1. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 U.S.C. §§ 1,	
20	et seq. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this counterclaim under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1338	
21	2201, and 2202.	
22	2. Microsoft Corporation ("Microsoft") is a Washington corporation with its	
23	principal place of business in Redmond, Washington.	
24	3. On information and belief, Plaintiff/Counterclaim Defendant InterTrust	
25	Technologies Corporation ("InterTrust") is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of	
26	business in Santa Clara, California.	
07		

1	4. InterTrust purports to be the owner of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,721 ("the '721	
2	Patent").	
3	5. InterTrust alleges that Microsoft has infringed the '721 Patent.	
4	6. InterTrust issued a press release on February 7, 2002. The press release stated that	
5	InterTrust had filed a lawsuit against Microsoft for patent infringement. The press release	
6	specificed that InterTrust "alleges infringement by Microsoft's 'Plug and Play' Driver	
. 7	Certification Program."	
8	7. Microsoft's certification of hardware drivers has not infringed, either directly or	
9	indirectly, any claim of the '721 Patent, and Microsoft is not liable for infringement thereof.	
10	8. An actual controversy, within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, exists	
11	between Microsoft, on the one hand, and InterTrust, on the other hand, with respect to the	
12	infringement or noninfringement of the '721 Patent.	
13	COUNT II – DECLARATORY <u>JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY OF THE '721 PATENT</u>	
14	9. Microsoft repeats and realleges paragraphs 1-5 of its Counterclaims, as if fully	
15	restated herein.	
16	10. The '721 Patent, and each claim thereof, is invalid for failing to comply with the	
17	provisions of the Patent Laws, including one or more of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112.	
18	11. An actual controversy, within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, exists	
19	between Microsoft, on the one hand, and InterTrust, on the other hand, with respect to whether	
20	the claims of the '721 Patent are valid or invalid.	
21	COUNT III – DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF UNENFORCEABILITY OF THE '721 PATENT	
22	12. Microsoft repeats and realleges paragraphs 1-5 of its Counterclaims, as if fully	
23	restated herein.	
24	13. Claims 1-43 of the '721 Patent application (SN 08/689,754), and claims 1-41 of	
25	the '721 Patent, were not and are not entitled to the benefit of any application filing date prior to	
26	August 12, 1996, under 35 U.S.C. § 120 or otherwise.	
27		

-7-

27

- 24. The '721 Patent is unenforceable due to the inequitable conduct of the '721 Patent applicants and/or agents before the Patent and Trademark Office in connection with the '721 Patent application (SN 08/689,754).
- 25. An actual controversy, within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, exists between Microsoft, on the one hand, and InterTrust, on the other hand, with respect to whether the claims of the '721 Patent are enforceable.

# COUNT IV – DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF UNENFORCEABILITY

- 26. Microsoft repeats and realleges paragraphs 1-5 and 12-24 of its Counterclaims, as if fully restated herein.
- 27. In prosecuting, marketing, and enforcing various related patents, including the '721 Patent, InterTrust has engaged in a pattern of obfuscation as to the scope of the patents, the prior art to the patents, and the alleged "inventions" of the patents. For example, InterTrust has accused non-infringing products of infringement, has buried Patent Office Examiners with a collection of more than 400 references, many of which were not related to the particular claims in issue, and has buried the Examiners with hundreds or thousands of pages of redundant, verbose, unclear text, effectively prohibiting a real comparison of the alleged "invention" versus the prior art. This pattern of intentional conduct constitutes an abuse of the patent system, unclean hands, misuse and illegal extension of the patent right, rendering the '721 Patent unenforceable, as well as invalid under Section 112.
- 28. An actual controversy, within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, exists between Microsoft, on the one hand, and InterTrust, on the other hand, with respect to whether the claims of the '721 Patent are enforceable.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Microsoft prays for the following relief:

A. The Court enter judgment against InterTrust, and dismiss with prejudice, any and all claims of the Complaint;

#### DECLARATION OF SERVICE VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL AND U.S. MAIL

I am more than eighteen years old and not a party to this action. My place of employment and business address is 1000 Marsh Road, Menlo Park, California 94025.

On April 12, 2002, I served:

# MICROSOFT CORPORATION'S FIRST AMENDED ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIMS

By transmitting a copy of the above-listed document(s) in PDF form via electronic mail Michael

H. Page at mhp@kvn.com, Christopher P. Isaac at chris.isaac@finnegan.com, Stephen E.

Taylor at staylor@tcolaw.com and James E. Geringer at james.geringer@klarquist.com and

10 also by placing true and correct copies of the above documents in an envelope addressed to:

11 John W. Keker, Esq. Christopher P. Isaac, Esq. Michael H. Page, Esq. FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, 12 KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP **GARRETT & DUNNER LLP** 710 Sansome Street 1300 I. Street, N.W. 13 Washington, DC 20005-3314 San Francisco, California 94111 14 Tel. No. 415-391-5400 Tel. No. 202-408-4000 Fax No. 415-397-7188 Fax No. 202-408-4400 15 Email: jwk@kvn.com Email: chris.isaac@finnegan.com Email: mhp@kvn.com 16 Attorneys for Plaintiff Attorneys for Plaintiff INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES 17

Attorneys for Plaintiff INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION

CORPORATION

Stephen E. Taylor, Esq.
TAYLOR & CO. LAW OFFICES
1050 Marina Village Parkway, Suite 101
Alameda, CA 94501
Tel. No. 510-865-9401
Fax No. 510-865-9408
Email: staylor@tcolaw.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff
INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES

CORPORATION

James E. Geringer, Esq.
KLARQUIST, SPARKMAN, LLP
One World Trade Center
121 S. W. Salmon Street, Suite 1600
Portland, Oregon 97204
Tel. No: 503-226-7391
Fax No: 503-228-9446
Email: john.vandenberg@klarquist.com
Email: james.geringer@klarquist.com
Attorneys for Defendant and

Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant, MICROSOFT CORPORATION

John D. Vandenberg, Esq.

27

25

26

18

28

111

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

and sealing the envelope, affixing adequate first-class postage and depositing it in the U.S. mail at Menlo Park, California. Executed on April 12, 2002 at Menlo Park, California. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Print Name Signature